Large deviation principle at fixed time in Glauber evolutions


Document status and date:
Published: 01/01/2002

Document Version:
Publisher’s PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:
• A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher’s website.
• The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
• The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.
Link to publication

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.
• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at: openaccess@tue.nl providing details and we will investigate your claim.
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1 Introduction

In the paper [1] it is proved that for a high-temperature Glauber dynamics started from a low-temperature Gibbs measure, the Gibbs property can be lost in the course of time. As long as the measure remains Gibbsian, we know that the empirical distribution satisfies a large deviation principle with the relative entropy density as a rate function. As soon as the Gibbs property is lost, we can a priori not even be sure of the existence of the relative entropy density as the Gibbs property is lost, we can a priori not even be sure of the existence of the large deviation principle with the relative entropy density as a rate function. As soon as the measure remains Gibbsian, we know that the empirical distribution satisfies the large deviation principle.

In the paper [1] it is proved that for a high-temperature Glauber dynamics started from a low-temperature Gibbs measure, the Gibbs property can be lost in the course of time. As long as the measure remains Gibbsian, we know that the empirical distribution satisfies the large deviation principle. The minimal such \( \Lambda \) is called the dependence set of \( f \).

\[ L^\sigma_A(\sigma) = \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{x \in A} \delta_{\tau_x \sigma} \]  

(1.1)

satisfy the large deviation principle.

The plan of the paper is as follows: we start by defining AD probability measures, and introduce the type of dynamics we study in section 2. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the conservation of the AD property.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Configuration space, dynamics

We consider Ising spin systems on the lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^d \), i.e., the configuration space is the compact metric space \( \Omega = \{-1, +1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \). The set of finite subsets of \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{S} \) and for any \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{S} \), we define its boundary to be \( \partial \Lambda = \{ x \in \Lambda : \exists y \in \Lambda^c, |x - y| = 1 \} \). The cube \( [-n, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \in \mathcal{S} \) is denoted by \( \Lambda_n \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). For \( A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \), we denote \( \mathcal{F}_A \) to be the sigma-field generated by the functions \( \{ \sigma : x \mapsto \sigma(x), x \in A \} \). We abbreviate \( \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \) by \( \mathcal{F} \). Functions \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) are called local (notation \( f \in \mathcal{L} \)) if there exists some finite \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{S} \) such that \( f \) is \( \mathcal{F}_\Lambda \)-measurable. The minimal such \( \Lambda \) is called the dependence set of \( f \) and is denoted by \( D_f \). Local functions are continuous and any continuous function is the uniform limit of local functions. The set of continuous functions \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) is written \( C(\Omega) \). For \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \), \( \tau_x \) denotes translation over \( x \), acting on elements of \( \Omega \) by \( \tau_x \sigma(y) = \sigma(y + x) \), on functions via \( \tau_x f(\sigma) = f(\tau_x \sigma) \) and on measures via \( \int f d\mu \circ \tau_x = \int \tau_x f d\mu \). The set of all probability measures on the Borel sigma-field of \( \Omega \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{M}_1^+ \) and the translation invariant elements are collected in the set denoted by \( \mathcal{M}_{1,inv}^+ \). For \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{S} \), we denote \( \sigma_\Lambda \) the restriction of \( \sigma \) to \( \Lambda \), and for \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{1,inv}^+ \), \( \mu_\Lambda \) is the distribution of \( \sigma_\Lambda \) when \( \sigma \) is distributed according to \( \mu \). For all \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \), \( \sigma_x \) denotes the spin configurations obtained from \( \sigma \) by flipping the spin at \( x \): \( \sigma_x^c(x) = -\sigma(x) \) and \( \sigma_x^c(y) = \sigma(y) \) if \( y \neq x \). As a dynamics we consider a Feller process with a generator of the type

\[ Lf(\sigma) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_x(\sigma) \nabla_x f(\sigma) \]  

(2.1)

where for all \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \), for all \( f \in \mathcal{F} \) bounded, for all \( \sigma \in \Omega \)

\[ \nabla_x f(\sigma) = f(\sigma^c) - f(\sigma). \]
For the flip rates $c_x$ we make the following assumptions:

1. Nearest neighbor dependence: For all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $c_x$ is a local function such that
   $$D_{c_x} = \{ y : |y - x| \leq 1 \}.$$

2. Strict positivity:
   $$\exists \epsilon > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad 0 < \epsilon = \min_{\sigma} c_x(\sigma) < \max_{\sigma} c_x(\sigma) < \infty.$$

3. Translation invariance:
   $$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad c_x = \tau_x c_0.$$

The restriction to nearest neighbor dependence of the rates is for convenience only; it can be replaced by finite range.

In [6] it is proved that there corresponds a semigroup $S(t)$ on $C(\Omega)$ and a unique Feller process to the generator $L$. We denote by $P_{\sigma}$ its path space measure started at $\sigma_0 = \sigma$, and $E_{\sigma}$ denotes the corresponding expectation. The semi group acts on functions: for all $t > 0$, for all $f \in C(\Omega)$, for all $\sigma \in \Omega$,

$$S(t)f(\sigma) = E_{\sigma}[f(\sigma_t)].$$

For a probability measure $\nu$ on $\Omega$, we define $\nu S(t)$ by

$$\int f \, d\nu S(t) = \int S(t)f \, d\nu. \quad (2.2)$$

### 2.2 Asymptotically decoupled measures

**Definition 2.3** A probability measure $\nu \in M_{1,\text{inv}}^+$ is called asymptotically decoupled (AD) if there exists sequences $d(n), c(n)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{c(n)}{\Lambda_n} = 0, \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{d(n)}{n} = 0$$

and for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_\Lambda$, $B \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_n+d(n)}$ with $\nu(A)\nu(B) \neq 0$:

$$e^{-c(n)} \leq \frac{\nu(A \cap B)}{\nu(A)\nu(B)} \leq e^{c(n)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Important examples of AD measures are Gibbs measures with a translation invariant absolutely summable interaction [4]. In this case we can choose $d(n) = 0$ and $c(n) = o(|\Lambda_n|)$, and in the case of finite range potentials $c(n) = o(|\partial \Lambda_n|)$. Examples of non-Gibbsian AD measures are renormalization group transformations such as decimation, block spin averaging and Kadanoff transformation of Gibbs measures [2, 3]. Indeed, it is clear from the definition that if, for a finite set $W$, we consider a transformation

$$T : \Omega \to W^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$$

such that $T\sigma(x)$ depends only on $\{ \sigma(y) : y \in B_x \}$ where for $x \neq x'$, $B_x \cap B_{x'} = \emptyset$ and such that $\max_x |B_x| < R \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then for $\nu$ AD, $\nu \circ T$ is AD. The simplest example of such a $T$ is $T\sigma(x) = \sigma(kx)$ (decimation). Let us denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the set of all translation invariant asymptotically decoupled probability measures. The following theorem is proved in [9].
Theorem 2.5 For all $\nu \in \mathcal{A}$, we have the following:

1. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}^+$, the relative entropy density
   \[ h(\mu|\nu) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \int d\mu_{\Lambda_n} \log \frac{d\mu_{\Lambda_n}}{d\nu_{\Lambda_n}} \] (2.6)
   exists.

2. For any $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$, the pressure
   \[ P_{\nu}(f) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \log \int \exp \left( \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \tau_x f \right) d\nu \] (2.7)
   exists.

3. $P_{\nu}(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot|\nu)$ are conjugate convex functions, i.e.,
   \[ h(\mu|\nu) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)} \left( \int f d\mu - P_{\nu}(f) \right) \]
   \[ P_{\nu}(f) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}^+} \left( \int f d\mu - h(\mu|\nu) \right) \] (2.8)

4. Under $\nu$, the empirical measures
   \[ L_n(\sigma) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \delta_{\tau_x \sigma} \] (2.9)
   satisfy the large deviation principle with rate function $I(\cdot) = h(\cdot|\nu)$, extended to $\mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}^+$ by putting $I(\mu) = \infty$ for $\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}^+$.

## 3 Result

In this section we prove

Theorem 3.1 Let $\nu \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $S(t)$ be the semi group of the generator (2.1), then $\nu S(t) \in \mathcal{A}$. In particular, for any $t > 0$, the random measures

\[ L^t_n = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \delta_{\tau_x \sigma_i} \]

satisfy the large deviation principle with rate function $h(\cdot|\nu S(t))$.

Proof. First notice that by the semi group property, it suffices to show that for some $t_0 > 0$, $\{\nu S(t) : \nu \in \mathcal{A}, t \leq t_0\} \subset \mathcal{A}$. The $t_0$ should depend only on the rates $c_x$ and not on the initial measure $\nu \in \mathcal{A}$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and choose $\nu \in \mathcal{A}$ with corresponding $c(n), d(n)$ of Definition (2.3). We will prove that there exists $t_0 > 0$, $c_1 > 0$ depending only on the rates such that for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_n}, B \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_n^{c(n)+d(n)+4}}$, and for all $t \leq t_0$:

\[ e^{-c(n)} e^{-c_1 |\partial \Lambda_n|} \leq \frac{\nu S(t)(A \cap B)}{\nu S(t)(A) \nu S(t)(B)} \leq e^{c(n)} e^{c_1 |\partial \Lambda_n|} \] (3.2)
which clearly implies that $\nu S(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ for $t \leq t_0$. The idea is to “artificially decouple” $A$ and $B$ by introducing in the process a “corridor” of independently flipping spins. This requires a modification of the process in a region of the order of the boundary of $\Lambda_n$. Then via a Girsanov’s formula and a cluster expansion we control the “price to pay” for this modification. It is because of the cluster expansion technique used that we first have to restrict to small $t$. Fix $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_n}$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{n+d(n+4)+4}}$ and denote $R_n = \Lambda_{n+4} \setminus \Lambda_n$, and $R_n' = \Lambda_{n+d(n+4)+4} \setminus \Lambda_{n+d(n+4)}$. Notice that since $d(n)/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ the regions $R_n, R_n'$ satisfy $|R_n \cup R_n'| = o(|\Lambda_n|)$. Introduce the following “decoupled generator”:

$$L_n = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} c_x \nabla_x + \sum_{x \in R_n \cup R_n'} \nabla_x + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus (\Lambda_n \cup R_n \cup R_n')} c_x \nabla_x. \tag{3.3}$$

In the process with generator $L_n$, the spins in $R_n' \cup R_n$ flip on the event times of independent rate one Poisson processes. By the nearest neighbor character of the flip rates $c_x$, this implies that under the path space measure $\mathbb{P}^n$, the random variables $\{\sigma_s(x) : x \in \Lambda_{n+d(n+4)+4}, 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ and $\{\sigma_s(x) : x \in \Lambda_n, 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ are independent. Moreover, again by the nearest neighbor character of the rates, for $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_n}$, $S_n(t)(1_A) \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{n+4}}$ and for $B \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{n+d(n+4)}}$, $S_n(t)(1_B)$ is $\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{n+d(n)}}$ measurable. Therefore we have

$$\int S_n(t)(1A1_B) d\nu = \int S_n(t)(1_A)S_n(t)(1_B) d\nu \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$e^{-c(n)} \leq \frac{\int S_n(t)(1_A)S_n(t)(1_B) d\nu}{\int S_n(t)(1_A) d\nu \int S_n(t)(1_B) d\nu} \leq e^{c(n)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Notice that we used here a consequence of (2.4), namely that for any non-negative $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_n}$, $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{n+d(n)}},$

$$e^{-c(n)} \leq \frac{\int (fg) d\nu}{\int f d\nu \int g d\nu} \leq e^{c(n)}. \tag{3.7}$$

This follows immediately from the definition (2.4) together with the fact that such $f, g$ can be approximated in $L^1(\nu)$ by linear combinations of indicator functions with positive coefficients. In order to prove (3.2), it is sufficient to have the existence of $t_0 > 0$, $\xi(n) = O(|\partial \Lambda_n|)$ such that all $t \leq t_0$,

$$e^{-\xi(n)} \leq \underset{C \in \mathcal{F}}{\inf} \frac{\nu S(t)(1_C)}{\nu S_n(t)(1_C)} \leq \underset{C \in \mathcal{F}}{\sup} \frac{\nu S(t)(1_C)}{\nu S_n(t)(1_C)} \leq e^{\xi(n)} \tag{3.6}$$

i.e., the measures $\nu S(t)$ and $\nu S_n(t)$ are absolutely continuous with a density that is uniformly bounded from below by $e^{-\xi(n)}$ and from above by $e^{\xi(n)}$. This can be expected from the fact that we modified our process only in a corridor, i.e. the generator $L_n$ differs from $L$ in the region $R_n \cup R_n'$ only. To obtain (3.6), it is in turn sufficient to check it on cylinder events and to prove that

$$e^{-\xi(n)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_\eta (I(\eta_N(x) = \sigma(x), \forall x \in \Lambda_N))}{\mathbb{P}_\eta (I(\eta_N(x) = \sigma(x), \forall x \in \Lambda_N))} \leq e^{\xi(n)} \tag{3.7}$$

where this inequality holds for all $\sigma, \eta, N$ with the same $\xi$. In order to obtain (3.7), we approximate by finite volume processes. For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, introduce the generator

$$L_M = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_M} \nabla_x + \sum_{x \in \Lambda_M} c_x \nabla_x. \tag{3.8}$$
Since the rates $c_x$ are nearest neighbor, $L_M$ generates a process on $\Omega_{M+1} = \{-1,+1\}^{\Lambda_{M+1}}$ and by the Trotter-Kurtz theorem ([6], chp 1) for the associated semi group $S_M(t)$ we have $S_M(t)f \rightarrow S(t)f$ uniformly on compacts as $M$ goes to infinity. Similarly, the finite volume approximation of $L_M$ is introduced by

$$L_M = \sum_{x \in R_n \cup R'_n} \nabla_x + \sum_{x \in \Lambda_M \setminus (R_n \cup R'_n)} c_x \nabla_x + \sum_{x \in \Lambda_M} \nabla_x.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

Therefore, in order to obtain (3.7), we have to prove

$$e^{-\xi(n)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}^M_{\eta} (I(\eta_t(x) = \sigma, \forall x \in \Lambda_N))}{\mathbb{E}^M_{\eta} (I(\eta_t(x) = \sigma, \forall x \in \Lambda_N))} \leq e^{\xi(n)} \hspace{1cm} (3.10)$$

where $\mathbb{E}^M_{\eta}$ denotes expectation in the process with generator $L_M$, $\mathbb{E}^n,M_{\eta}$ expectation in the process with generator $L^n_M$ and where the $\xi$ of the inequality (3.10) does not depend on $\eta, \sigma, N$ and $M > N > n$. Finally introduce the generator of the independent spin flip process:

$$L^0 = \sum_x \nabla_x \hspace{1cm} (3.11)$$

and $\mathbb{P}^\sigma_\eta$, $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_\eta$ for corresponding path space measure and expectation. By Girsanov's formula, the ratio in (3.10) can be rewritten as a quotient of expectations in the process of independent spin flips, and we are led to show that

$$e^{-\xi(n)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}^0_{\eta} \left( e^{\sum_{x \in \Lambda_M} \Psi^t_x} \prod_{x \in \Lambda_N} I(\eta_t(x) = \sigma(x)) \right)}{\mathbb{E}^\sigma_\eta \left( e^{\sum_{x \in \Lambda_M \setminus (R_n \cup R'_n)} \Psi^t_x} \prod_{x \in \Lambda_N} I(\eta_t(x) = \sigma(x)) \right)} \leq e^{\xi(n)} \hspace{1cm} (3.12)$$

where $\xi$ does not depend on $\sigma, \eta$ and $M$ and where

$$\Psi^t_x = \int_0^t \log(c_x(\sigma_s))dN^x_s - \int_0^t (c_x(\sigma_s) - 1)ds \hspace{1cm} (3.13)$$

and $N^x_s$ denotes the number of flips at $x$ in the time interval $[0,s]$. Let us denote by $\mathbb{P}^\sigma_{M,t,\eta,\sigma}$ the “bridge between $\eta$ and $\sigma$”, i.e. the measure $\mathbb{P}^\sigma_\eta$ conditioned on the event $\{\eta_t(x) = \sigma(x), \forall x \in \Lambda_M\}$. We can rewrite the ratio of (3.12) as follows

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( e^{\sum_{x \in \Lambda_M} \Psi^t_x} \right)}{\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( e^{\sum_{x \in \Lambda_M \setminus (R_n \cup R'_n)} \Psi^t_x} \right)} \hspace{1cm} (3.14)$$

This expression has the form of the ratio of two ‘abstract’ partition functions of different volumes, i.e., a quotient of the form

$$\frac{Z_{\Lambda_M}}{Z_{\Lambda_M \setminus R_n \cup R'_n}} \hspace{1cm} (3.15)$$

If for the logarithm of $Z_{\Lambda}$ we can write a convergent cluster expansion, then it is clear that the ratio is of the order $e^{R_n \cup R'_n}$. The natural parameter which has to be chosen small in order to ensure convergence of the cluster expansion will be the time $t$. However, since we are working with a conditioned expectation $\mathbb{E}^\sigma_{M,t,\eta,\sigma}$, we cannot expect that the
exponential $e^{\sum_x \Psi_x^t}$ is close to one as $t$ tends to zero. Indeed for the lattice sites $x \in \Lambda_M$ such that $\sigma(x) \neq \eta(x)$, at least one jump took place in the conditioned measure $\mathbb{P}^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma}$, and the integral $\int \log(c_x(\sigma_x))dN^x_{\sigma}$ equals $\log(c_x(\eta^x)/c_x(\sigma))$ if precisely one jump of $N^x_{\sigma}$ took place in the interval $[0,t]$. To remedy this problem, we will subtract from $\Psi_x^t$ the value it takes in the limit $t \to 0$ in the conditioned measure $\mathbb{P}^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma}$, which is

$$\varphi_x(\eta, \sigma) = \log \frac{c_x(\eta^x)}{c_x(\sigma)} I(\eta(x) \neq \sigma(x)). \quad (3.16)$$

By an expansion of the exponential function around zero, we will then prove that the logarithm of the expectation

$$E^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( e^{\sum_x (\Psi_x^t - \varphi_x)} \right) \quad (3.17)$$

can be given by a convergent cluster expansion for small $t$. In order to set up the expansion, remind that the rates $c_x$ depend on $\sigma(y)$ for $|y-x| \leq 1$. Under the measure $\mathbb{P}^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma}$, the spins at different lattice sites evolve independently. Therefore, if $x, y$ are more than one lattice distant apart, the random variables $\Psi_x^t$ and $\Psi_y^t$ are independent. For a set $A \in \mathcal{S}$, we denote

$$\bar{A} = \{ y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d(y,A) \leq 1 \}.$$ 

Two connected subsets $A$ and $B$ are called compatible if $\bar{A} \cap \bar{B} = \emptyset$ With this notation, we write

$$E^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( e^{\sum_x (\Psi_x^t - \varphi_x)} \right) = E^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( \prod_{x \in \Lambda_M} \left( (e^{\Psi_x^t - \varphi_x} - 1) + 1 \right) \right) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \subset \Lambda_M} \prod_{i=1}^{k} w_{t,\eta,\sigma}(\gamma_i) \quad (3.18)$$

where the sum over $\gamma_i$ is over compatible collections of nearest neighbor connected subsets. The polymer weights are given by

$$w_{t,\eta,\sigma}(\gamma) = E^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( \prod_{x \in \gamma} \left( e^{\Psi_x^t - \varphi_x} - 1 \right) \right). \quad (3.19)$$

In order to write down a convergent cluster expansion of the logarithm of the right hand site of (3.18), we use the Kotecký-Preiss criterion, i.e., we have to prove an estimate of the type

$$|w_{t,\eta,\sigma}(\gamma)| \leq e^{-c_\gamma |\gamma|} \quad (3.20)$$

where the constant $c_\gamma$ does not depend on $\eta, \sigma$ and where $c_\gamma \to \infty$ as $t \to 0$. Indeed if that estimate holds, then for $t$ small enough the weights will beat the entropy and we can write

$$\log E^o_{M,t,\eta,\sigma} \left( e^{\sum_x (\Psi_x^t - \varphi_x)} \right) = \sum_{\Gamma \subset \Lambda_M} a(\Gamma) w_{t,\eta,\sigma}(\Gamma) \quad (3.21)$$

where the sum is over clusters, i.e., multi-indices of compatible polymers, see e.g., [5, 8, 10]. In order to obtain (3.20), remind that the rates $c_x$ are bounded away from zero and infinity, and hence we can estimate

$$\mathbb{E}[|e^{\Psi_x^t} - 1|] \leq \mathbb{E}[(e^{Bt} e^{AN^t_{\sigma}} I(N^t_{\sigma} \geq 2) - 1) I(\eta(x) \neq \sigma(x)) + (e^{Bt} e^{AN^t_{\sigma}} - 1) I(\eta(x) = \sigma(x))] \quad (3.22)$$
where we used that, by the choice of \(\varphi_x\), the integral \( \int_0^t \log c_x(\sigma_s) dN^x_s = \varphi_x\) if the Poisson process \(N^x\) made exactly one jump in the time interval \([0, t]\). Arrived at this point, the weight can be estimated as follows

\[
|w_{t, \eta, \sigma}(\gamma)| \leq \prod_{x \in \gamma \cap \Delta(\eta, \sigma)} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left( I(N^x_t \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1)(e^{Bt}e^{AN^x_t}I(N^x_t \geq 2) - 1) \right)}{\mathbb{E}(I(N^x_t \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1))} \times \prod_{x \in \gamma \cap \Delta^c(\eta, \sigma)} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left( I(N^x_t \in 2\mathbb{N})(e^{Bt}e^{AN^x_t} - 1) \right)}{\mathbb{E}(I(N^x_t \in 2\mathbb{N}))}
\]  

(3.23)

where \(\mathbb{E}\) denotes expectation w.r.t. independent mean one Poisson processes, and where

\[
\Delta(\eta, \sigma) = \{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \sigma(x) \neq \eta(x) \}
\]  

(3.24)
i.e., the sites where the spin flipped an uneven number of times. A straightforward computation using that \(N^x_t\) is Poisson gives

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( I(N^x_t \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1)(e^{Bt}e^{AN^x_t}I(N^x_t \geq 2) - 1) \right) \leq \left( (e^{Bt} - 1) \frac{t}{\sinh(t)} + O(t^3) \right) \sinh(t) \]  

(3.25)

and

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( I(N^x_t \in 2\mathbb{N})(e^{Bt}e^{AN^x_t} - 1) \right) \leq e^{Bt} \cosh(t) - \cosh(t). \cosh(t). \]  

(3.26)

Since both expressions do not depend on \(\sigma, \eta\) and converge to zero as \(t \to 0\), we obtain the estimate (3.20). This implies that we can write

\[
\mathbb{E}_n^M (I(\eta_t(x) = \sigma(x), \forall x \in \Lambda_N)) = \mathbb{E}_n^M (I(\eta_t(x) = \sigma(x), \forall x \in \Lambda_N)) \leq \exp \left( \sum_{\Gamma \cap (\Lambda_n \cup R'_n) \neq \emptyset} a(\Gamma)w_{t, \eta, \sigma}(\Gamma) \right) \prod_{x \in \Lambda_n \cup R'_n} e^{\varphi_x} \leq \exp \left( C|\Lambda_n \cup R'_n| \right)
\]  

(3.27)

which concludes the proof of the theorem.
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